

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims define patentable subject matter.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 1, 2 and 7 are allowed, and claims 4 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 3 and 6 are newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Sakamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,736,875; hereafter "Sakamoto"). Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejection.

With regard to claims 3 and 6, the Examiner asserts that Figure 5 of Sakamoto discloses all of the features of the claimed inventions. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Sakamoto does not teach or suggest that "the first and second threshold-value decision elements receive the first and second threshold values from the first and second regulators" as required by amended claims 3 and 6.

As shown in Figure 4 of the present application, the first and second regulators R1 and R2 output the first and second threshold values V1 and V2, respectfully, and the first and second threshold-value decision elements S1 and S2 receive the first and second threshold values V1 and V2 from the first and second regulators R1 and R2. On the other hand, Sakamoto discloses that the output signals of comparators 22 and 23 (which the Examiner asserts correspond to the claimed regulators) are input to a differential amplifier 24, and the output of the differential amplifier 24 is processed by a reference voltage generator 14 and voltage adders 20 and 21

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/977/297

before being input to discriminators 12 and 13 (which the Examiner asserts correspond to the claimed the first and second threshold-value decision elements).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3 and 6 would not have been anticipated by or rendered obvious in view of Sakamoto because the cited reference does not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Lipp  
Registration No. 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 14, 2007